

### **REMARKS**

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

#### **Status of Claims**

Claims 1, 8 and 13 through 15 have been cancelled.

No claims have been withdrawn.

No claims have been added.

Claims 2 through 7, 9 through 12, and 16 through 23 remain in this application.

The Examiner's rejections will be considered in the order of their occurrence in the Office Action.

#### **Paragraphs 1 through 3 of the Office Action**

Claim 22 has been objected to for the informalities noted in the Office Action.

Claim 22 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is not supported by either a specific and substantial asserted utility or a well established utility. The examiner consider the claim to be non-statutory since the phrase "in combination" does not specifically provide substantial established step of making what is being claimed.

Claims 22 have been amended in a manner believed to clarify any informalities in the language. Specifically, the preamble of claim 22 has been changed from "In combination" to "A system for monitoring computer usage, comprising". It is submitted that this requirement ties the preamble of the claim to the body of the claim.

Withdrawal of the objection to and §101 rejection of claim 22 is therefore respectfully requested.

**Paragraphs 4 and 5 of the Office Action**

Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sutton, Jr. in view of the (alleged) applicant's admitted prior art.

Furthermore, paragraph 5 of the Office Action states that claims 8 through 12 would be allowable if written into independent form with the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The above amendment incorporates the requirements of claim 8 into claim 7, and as claim 8 was indicated as being allowable, it is submitted that claim 7 as amended, as well as claims 9 through 12 which depend from claim 7, are in condition for allowance.

It is therefore submitted that the cited patents, and especially the allegedly obvious combination of Sutton, Jr. and the applicant's admitted prior art set forth in the rejection of the Office Action, would not lead one skilled in the art to the applicant's invention as required by claim 7.


Withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of claim 7 is therefore respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

WOODS, FULLER, SHULTZ & SMITH P.C.



Jeffrey A. Proehl (Reg. No. 35,987)  
Customer No. **40,158**  
P.O. Box 5027  
Sioux Falls, SD 57117-5027  
(605)336-3890 FAX (605)339-3357

Date: MARCH 10, 2009